

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff

v.

SCHUYLER PYATTE BARBEAU,

Defendant.

NO. CR15-391RAJ

GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE TO
MOTION TO CONTINUE

The United States of America, by and through Annette L. Hayes, United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, Todd Greenberg, Assistant United States Attorney for said District, and Jessica Manca, Special Assistant United States Attorney for said District, respectfully submits this response to the defendant's Motion to Continue (Dkt. 109).

On June 2, 2017, Defendant Barbeau filed a motion to continue the trial in this matter, which is scheduled to begin on June 5, 2017. The motion seeks a continuance for two reasons, both of which are meritless. The Court should deny the motion in all respects.

//

//

1 **A. The Grand Jury Testimony of Special Agent Bennett.**

2 On March 30, 2016, the government produced in discovery two transcripts of
3 grand jury testimony given by FBI Special Agent Daniel Bennett, the case agent assigned
4 to this matter. At the pretrial conference on May 24, 2017, Barbeau informed the
5 government that he could not locate the grand jury transcripts and believed that his prior
6 counsel did not provide the transcripts to him. The government provided Mr. Barbeau
7 with a second copy of the transcripts during the hearing.

8 Barbeau now claims that he can “prove” the agent “perjured himself” in the
9 transcripts, but that he needs additional time to do so. Barbeau does not further explain
10 the purported perjury or why he needs additional time.

11 The Court should deny the motion for continuance on this basis. The grand jury
12 transcripts are Jencks Act materials that were timely produced well in advance of trial
13 (even the production on May 24th was far earlier than the Jencks Act requires).
14 Moreover, the transcripts are available to Barbeau to use during the cross-examination of
15 Special Agent Bennett, so he will suffer no prejudice if the trial begins as scheduled.

16 **B. The Undercover Recording.**

17 At the pretrial hearing, Barbeau filed a motion to compel discovery related to a
18 conversation he recalled having in 2015 with an undercover FBI agent in another
19 investigation. The government explained to the Court that the FBI was attempting to
20 verify whether that conversation took place and, if so, whether it was recorded. At the
21 time of the pretrial hearing, the FBI had not been able to identify or confirm any such
22 conversation.

23 After the pretrial hearing, the FBI continued to investigate this matter, including
24 listening to hours of recordings made during the other investigation. This diligence by
25 the FBI agents resulted in them finding a conversation between Barbeau and undercover
26 agents which took place on February 10, 2015, in Phoenix, Arizona. On June 1, 2017,
27 the FBI provided the undersigned AUSAs with a copy of this recording, and we produced
28

1 it to stand-by counsel that same day. The recording lasts approximately three hours and
2 ten minutes.

3 The production of this recording on June 1, 2017, does not establish any basis to
4 grant a trial continuance in this case. First, Barbeau is not entitled to introduce any of his
5 statements made on the recording, because those out-of-court statements are inadmissible
6 hearsay. Although the government is entitled to introduce the out-of-court statements of
7 a defendant as a statement of a party-opponent, the defendant may not do the same. An
8 out-of-court statement of a declarant offered by the declarant on his own behalf is
9 inadmissible hearsay because, among other things, it is not a statement by a party-
10 opponent. *See United States v. Ortega*, 203 F.3d 675, 682 (9th Cir. 2000); *see also*
11 *Williamson v. United States*, 512 U.S. 594, 600 (1994) (the hearsay rule excludes self-
12 serving statements because such statements “are exactly the ones which people are most
13 likely to make even when they are false”).

14 Second, the contents of the recording are extremely incriminating for Barbeau, and
15 very different from the way Barbeau described the conversation to the Court at the
16 pretrial conference. For example, during the recording, Barbeau makes the following
17 statements about the short-barreled rifle at issue in the instant case:

- 18 • “My gun violates a lot of NFA and state laws.”
- 19
- 20 • “It’s not legal in any way, shape or form.”
- 21
- 22 • When asked if the rifle is illegal because it is automatic, Barbeau responds,
23 “Yeah.”
- 24
- 25 • “I built it so that it can be automatic, and it’s a short barrel.”
- 26
- 27 • “You can buy a short barrel, you can buy it. But once it’s in your
28 possession...if you want to attach it to a lower receiver, the whole weapon
is now a short barrel rifle. And to have it like that is illegal unless you go
and you get your SBR tax stamp and get the paperwork for it.”

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Schuyler Barbeau, *pro se*
Federal Detention Center - SeaTac
Reg: 46153-086
P.O. Box 13900
Seattle, WA 98198-1090

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28